



Friday, October 26, 2007 - Page updated at 02:01 AM

Permission to reprint or copy this article or photo, other than personal use, must be obtained from The Seattle Times. Call 206-464-3113 or e-mail resale@seattletimes.com with your request.

"No" to elected county auditor

When voters are asked if they want more say in a matter, usually they say yes. So the odds are heavily stacked in favor of the ill-considered King County Initiative 25.

This measure asks voters if they want to vote next November to amend the charter and make the elections director, currently an appointed position, an elected post. The natural, knee-jerk response is yes, sure. But the *correct* answer is **no**, this is completely unnecessary.

Electing an elections director will politicize the office because the individual in office may operate in ways that lead to re-election.

The argument for directly electing the chief is a kind of everybody-else-is-doing-it affair, a reference to other counties around the state where voters elect their auditors.

King County is not the same as every other county. It is a very large, complex organization that would function best with an appointed person who has high-level technical skills. This is more likely to be the case if the director is appointed.

The motivation for the initiative stems in part from the 2004 governor's race, when the county elections office committed numerous missteps and became the focal point of misgivings over the most controversial election in state history.

But, things have calmed down considerably. Besides, it is unwise to make policy based on one or two years of trouble.

An appointed elections director will produce the most-efficiently managed office.

Say no. Really, say no, emphatically, to I-25.

[Copyright © 2007 The Seattle Times Company](#)